

**From:** Hatcher, Kelly  
**To:** 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'  
**Date:** 1/23/02 10:29am  
**Subject:** Microsoft Settlement

As a software engineer with 17 years' experience developing software for Unix, Windows, Macintosh, and Linux, I'd like to comment on the Proposed Final Judgment in United States v. Microsoft.

\* The PFJ doesn't take into account Windows-compatible competing operating systems

\* The PFJ Contains Misleading and Overly Narrow Definitions and Provisions

- The definition of API fails to meet the definition actually used in the industry by being overly restrictive and limited.
- The definition of "Windows Operating System Product" fails to mention all of the "Operating Systems" listed by Microsoft on their website

- \* Windows XP

- Windows XP
  - Windows XP Professional
  - Windows XP Home

- \* Windows 2000

- Windows 2000 Professional
  - Windows 2000 Server
  - Windows 2000 Advanced Server
  - Windows 2000 Datacenter Server

- \* Windows Embedded

- Windows Embedded
  - Windows CE .NET
  - Windows XP Embedded
  - Windows XP Tablet PC Edition

Considering these problems, one must conclude that the Proposed Final Judgment as written allows and encourages significant anticompetitive practices to continue, and would delay the emergence of competing Windows-compatible operating systems. Therefore, the Proposed Final Judgment is not in the public interest, and should not be adopted without addressing these issues.

---

Kelly Hatcher  
Vignette

---

512.741.1115  
Austin, TX